

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed June 6, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of claims 14-20, and the allowance of claim 4 if rewritten to include all limitations recited in independent claim 1 and intervening claims 2 and 3.

Claims 1-20 have been examined. By this amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 12 and 13 as shown above, and cancels claims 2-4, 10 and 11 without prejudice or disclaimer. As a result, claims 1, 5-9 and 12-20 are pending for examination, of which claims 1, 9 and 14 are independent.

1. Claims 1 and 5-8 are in Condition for Allowance

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as purportedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,173,421 (Johnson). Further, claim 4 stands objected-to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (claim 1), but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 1 and intervening claims 2 and 3.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection of claim 1 as being anticipated by Johnson. However, to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include all of the limitations recited in claim 4 and intervening claims 2 and 3.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 as amended patentably distinguishes over the art of record, including Johnson, and requests that the rejection of claim 1 under §102(e) be withdrawn. Claims 5-8 each dependent from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

2. Claims 9, 12 and 13 are in Condition for Allowance

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as purportedly being anticipated by Johnson. Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, Applicant has amended claim 9 as shown above to expedite prosecution of this application.

On September 29, 2005, Applicant's representative, Daniel P. McLoughlin, left a voicemail message with the Examiner, proposing to amend claim 9 to include the limitations of 10 and 11 and a limitation similar to that recited in claim 4 (i.e., "wherein said routine

comprises a communication routine enabling said host system and said target system to communicate"). Applicant submitted that such amendment would place claim 9 in condition for allowance.

On September 30, 2005, Examiner McCarthy left a voicemail message for Applicant's representative, Daniel P. McLoughlin. He indicated that his preliminary assessment was that claim 9 amended as such would be in condition for allowance, although he would reserve final judgment until after he had reviewed claim 9 so amended.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 9 as shown above to include the limitations of claims 10 and 11 and by adding "wherein said routine comprises a communication routine enabling said host system and said target system to communicate."

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 as amended patentably distinguishes over the art of record, including Johnson, and requests that the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn. Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 9 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Phillips, Applicant

By:


Daniel P. McLoughlin, Reg. No. 46, 066
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2211
Tel. No.: (617) 720-3500
Attorney for Applicant

Docket No.: S1022.80618US00

Date: October 5, 2005